Discrete phase-space mappings, tomographic condition and permutation invariance

C. Muñoz[1] and A. B. Klimov[1,2]
[2]*Dept. de Física, Universidad de Guadalajara, 44420 Guadalajara, Mexico*
[2]*Center of Quantum Optics and Quantum Information, Center for Optics and Photonics, Departamento de Física, Universidad de Concepción, Casilla-160C, Concepción, Chile.*
(Dated: March 4, 2016)

We analyze different families of discrete maps in the N-qubit systems in the context of the permutation invariance. We prove that the tomographic condition imposed on the self-dual (Wigner) map is incompatible with the requirement of the invariance under particle permutations, which makes it impossible to project the Wootters-like Wigner function into the space of symmetric measurements. We also provide several *explicit* forms of the self-dual mappings: a) tomographic and b) permutation invariant and analyze the symmetric projection in the latter case.

PACS numbers:

arXiv:1603.00916v1 [quant-ph] 2 Mar 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Phase-space methods [1–3] have been widely applied in quantum mechanics both for state visualization and analysis of quantum-classical transitions from kinematical and dynamic perspectives. According to this approach quantum states are mapped into distributions on some manifold, which is associated with a "classical" phase-space. The structure of the mapping as well as their principal characteristics depend on the symmetry of a given quantum system. The basic requirement for any meaningful phase-space representation is the covariance under an appropriate group of transformations (which is one of the fundamental Stratonovich-Weyl conditions [4], [5], [6]). In the case of continuous symmetries and when the operators from the group representation act irreducibly in the Hilbert space of the quantum system, the phase-space manifold can be constructed as a certain quotient space and has an intimate relation to the set of coherent states [7] - [14]. Then, a systematic procedure for the so-called s-parametrized phase-space mapping can be suggested at least for some type of dynamic symmetry groups [6, 13, 15].

The situation is essentially more involved in case of discrete systems. Although several approaches for representation of states of a generic d-dimensional system in a discrete lattice were considered [16], an explicit self-consistent map possessing all the required properties can be constructed only when $d = p^N$, where p is a prime number [17]. Then, a discrete $p^N \times p^N$ grid, playing the role of the phase-space $\mathcal{M}_{p^N}$, possesses the same basic geometric properties as an ordinary plane and allows a direct association of states with specific geometrical structures [17], [18] related to the notion of mutually unbiased bases [19]. A set of dual maps from the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{p^N}$ to $\mathcal{M}_{p^N}$ can be introduced in a similar way as in the continuous case [20], [21], [22]. It is worth noting, that in this approach only the "boundary" maps, corresponding to the familiar P and Q functions [5] - [9], are uniquely defined. All the other maps still can be "refined" by imposing additional conditions to the standard Stratonovich-Weyl requirements. One possible condition could be the marginal reduction, i.e. that summing the image of the density matrix in $\mathcal{M}_{p^N}$ (a quasidistribution function) along a set of points associated with a given state one obtains the probability distribution in this state. This requirement gives a clear geometric interpretation of the discrete map and is also known as a tomographic condition.

Regrettably, none of the discrete phase-space representations is efficient for the visualization of states of large compound (many-particle) quantum systems [23]. It is mainly related to the ordering problem on $\mathcal{M}_{p^N}$, but is also connected to the classical indistinguishability between irreducible degenerated subspaces (subspaces of the same dimensions that appear in the decomposition of $\mathcal{H}_p^{\otimes N}$). The use of the so-called projected Q-function for the analysis of N-qubit systems, $d = 2^N$ was recently proposed in [24]. Such a function is defined in a three-dimensional discrete $N \times N \times N$ space and contains full and non-redundant information about results of measurements of any invariant under particle permutations observable in an arbitrary (not necessarily symmetric) state. Unfortunately, being a positive image of the density matrix, the projected Q-function is not convenient for graphical representation of the interference pattern and it would be desirable to find a symmetric map allowing to distinguish between coherent and incoherent superpositions.

In this paper we analyze the s-parametrized family of discrete maps for N-qubits systems from the perspective of projection into the space of symmetric measurements and discuss several possibilities of constructing discrete maps according to established invariance properties.

In Sec.II we briefly recall the concept of s-parametrized discrete mappings. In Sec.III we provide explicit forms for discrete mappings under different symmetry conditions and prove the inconsistency between the tomographic and permutation-invariance requirements. We also discuss the projected form of self-dual mappings invariant under particle permutations.

II. DISCRETE PHASE-SPACE AND DISCRETE MAPPINGS

Here we will be interested in transformations induced by elements of the generalized Pauli group $\mathcal{P}^N$ acting in the N-qubit Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{2^N} = \{|\kappa\rangle,\ \kappa \in \mathbb{F}_{2^N}\}$. In this case, the discrete phase space (DPS) is a $2^N \times 2^N$ grid, which points (α, β), $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_{2^N}$ label elements of a monomial operational basis [25], [26] $Z_\alpha X_\beta$, being

$$Z_\alpha = \sum_\alpha \chi(\alpha\kappa)|\kappa\rangle\langle\kappa|, \quad X_\beta|\kappa\rangle = \sum_\beta |\kappa+\beta\rangle\langle\kappa|, \quad (1)$$

$$\chi(\alpha) = (-1)^{tr(\alpha)},\ tr(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \alpha^{2^i}, \quad (2)$$

generators of $\mathcal{P}^N$, $Z_\alpha X_\beta = \chi(\alpha\kappa)\, X_\beta Z_\alpha$. In terms of expansion coefficients of $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{2^N}$ in a self-dual basis $\{\theta_1, ..., \theta_N\}$, $tr(\theta_i\, \theta_j) = \delta_{ij}$,

$$\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i\, \theta_i\ ,\ a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_2, \quad (3)$$

one can associate Z_α and X_β with N-particle operators

$$Z_\alpha = \sigma_z^{a_1} \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_z^{a_N}, \quad X_\beta = \sigma_x^{b_1} \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_x^{b_N},$$

where $\sigma_z = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$, $\sigma_x = |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0|$, acting in $\mathcal{H}_{2^N} = \mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes N} = \{|\kappa\rangle = |k_1, ..., k_N\rangle, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_2\}$. In the N-tuple $|k_1, ..., k_N\rangle$, where k_i are expansion coefficients of κ in the self-dual basis, each qubit is then associated with a particular element of the basis: $\text{qubit}_i \Leftrightarrow \theta_i$. This DPS (isomorphic to a product of two-dimensional discrete torus $T^2 \otimes T^2 \otimes ...$) is endowed with a finite geometry [17] and admits a set of discrete symplectic transformations [20], [21]. Thus, in complete similarity with the continuous case, the axes of the discrete phase-space are associated with the complementary observables Z_α and X_β in the sense that any eigenstate of either one of them is a state of maximum uncertainty with respect to the other.

An s-parametrized set of quasidistribution functions satisfying the standard Stratanovich-Weyl conditions is defined through the following one-to-one map [20], [22],

$$W_f^{(s)}(\alpha, \beta) = \text{Tr}\left[\hat{f}\Delta^{(s)}(\alpha, \beta)\right], \quad (4)$$

$$\hat{f} = \frac{1}{2^N}\sum_{\alpha,\beta} W_f^{(s)}(\alpha, \beta)\Delta^{(-s)}(\alpha, \beta). \quad (5)$$

where the mapping kernel has the form

$$\Delta^{(s)}(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{2^N}\sum_{\gamma,\delta} \chi(\alpha\delta + \beta\gamma)\left[\langle\xi| D(\gamma, \delta) |\xi\rangle\right]^{-s} D(\gamma, \delta), \quad (6)$$

here

$$D(\gamma, \delta) = \phi(\gamma, \delta) Z_\gamma X_\delta, \quad (7)$$

$$\phi(\gamma, \delta)\phi^*(\gamma, \delta) = 1,\ \phi(0, \delta) = \phi(\gamma, 0) = 1, \quad (8)$$

are the (unitary) displacement operators and the fiducial state $|\xi\rangle$ is chosen in such a way that $\langle\xi| D(\gamma, \delta) |\xi\rangle \neq 0$.

The kernel is (6) normalized

$$\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \Delta(\alpha, \beta) = 2^N,$$

covariant

$$D(\kappa, \lambda)\, \Delta(\alpha, \beta)\, D^\dagger(\kappa, \lambda) = \Delta(\alpha + \kappa, \beta + \lambda), \quad (9)$$

and in addition it is Hermitian, $\Delta(\alpha, \beta) = \Delta^\dagger(\alpha, \beta)$, if the phase (8) satisfies the condition,

$$\phi^2(\gamma, \delta) = \chi(\gamma\delta), \quad (10)$$

which also leads to the unitarity of the displacement operator, $D^\dagger(\gamma, \delta) = D(\gamma, \delta)$.

The overlap relation

$$\text{Tr}\left(\Delta^{(s)}(\alpha, \beta)\Delta^{(-s)}(\alpha', \beta')\right) = 2^N \delta_{\alpha\alpha'}\delta_{\beta\beta'},$$

is automatically fulfilled and allows the evaluatation of the trace of a product in the form of a convolution,

$$\text{Tr}(\hat{f}\hat{g}) = 2^N \sum_{\alpha,\beta} W_f^{(s)}(\alpha, \beta) W_g^{(-s)}(\alpha, \beta).$$

III. SYMMETRIES OF DPS MAPPING

The representation of an N-qubit state ρ in DPS by any of $W_\rho^{(s)}(\alpha, \beta)$ has an important drawback: while for a small number of particles the plot of quasidistributions is representative, it becomes extremely involved and is practically useless for analysis of quantum states when $N \gg 1$ [23]. In part it is a consequence of the absence of a natural ordering of elements of $\mathbb{F}_{2^N}$. In addition, the central limit theorem is not directly applicable to the distributions labeled by N-tuples (representations of $\mathbb{F}_{2^N}$) $\{(a_1, ..., a_N),\ a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_2\}$. This explains an essentially smaller number (with respect to the continuous case) of applications of the discrete phase-space representations in many-body quantum mechanics.

A. Permutation-invariant $s = \pm 1$ mapping

Nevertheless, this problem can be fixed if the available set of measurements is restricted only to symmetric observables $\{\hat{S}\}$, i.e. invariant under particle permutations, $\hat{S} = \hat{\Pi}_{ij}\hat{S}\hat{\Pi}_{ij}$, , $i, j = 1, ...N$, where $\hat{\Pi}_{ij}$ is the permutation operator [24]. It results that if the fiducial state $|\xi\rangle$

in (6) is permutation-invariant (i.e. it is a spin coherent state), and $\langle\xi|\, D(\gamma,\delta)\,|\xi\rangle \neq 0$, the image $W_S^{(\pm1)}(\alpha,\beta)$ of any symmetric operator $\hat{S}$, is a function only of the (permutation) invariants constructed on the phase-space coordinates (α,β)

$$h\left(\alpha\right)=\sum_{i=0}^{N}a_i,\quad h\left(\beta\right)=\sum_{i=0}^{N}b_i, \tag{11}$$
$$h(\alpha{+}\beta)=\sum_{i=0}^{N}\{a_i+b_i\},$$

where $\{a_i+b_i\}$ means sum mod 2, and $0\leq h\left(\kappa\right)\leq N$. In other words, $W_S^{(\pm1)}(\alpha,\beta)$ are permutation-invariant functions of the phase-space coordinates, where α and β are considered as N-tuples, $\alpha=(a_1,...,a_N)$, according to (3).

Thus, the full information about the results of measurements of any symmetric observable in an (arbitrary) N-qubit state ρ is contained in the projection of $W_\rho^{(\pm1)}(\alpha,\beta)$ into the 3 dimensional space spanned by $h\left(\alpha\right)$, $h\left(\beta\right)$, $h(\alpha{+}\beta)$ (space of symmetric measurements),

$$\tilde{W}_\rho^{(\pm1)}\left(m,n,k\right)=\sum_{\alpha,\beta}W_\rho^{(\pm1)}\left(\alpha,\beta\right)\delta_{m,h(\alpha)}\delta_{n,h(\beta)}\delta_{k,h(\alpha+\beta)} \tag{12}$$

While the distribution $W_\rho^{(1)}\left(\alpha,\beta\right)$ (corresponding to the P-function) becomes quite singular for large number of qubits, $W_\rho^{(-1)}\left(\alpha,\beta\right)$ (the Q-function) tends to a smooth distribution when $N\gg1$ and is very convenient for analysis of quantum states in the macroscopic limit [24]. It is worth noting here that

$$\Delta^{(-1)}(\alpha,\beta)=|\alpha,\beta\rangle\langle\alpha,\beta|, \tag{13}$$

where $|\alpha,\beta\rangle = D(\alpha,\beta)|\xi\rangle$ are the so-called discrete coherent states, that form an informational complete set of POVMs when $\langle\xi|\, D(\gamma,\delta)\,|\xi\rangle \neq 0$.

B. Covariant (Wigner) mapping

Unfortunately, the projection $\tilde{W}_\rho^{(-1)}$ does not distinguish very well between coherent and incoherent superpositions due to the typical (for the Q-function form) of the mapping kernel (13). For instance, for the GHZ state $|GHZ\rangle = \sim|0...0\rangle+|1...1\rangle = |0\rangle+|1\rangle$, where in the last equation $0,1\in\mathbb{F}_{2^N}$ one has

$$\tilde{W}_{GHZ}^{(-1)}\left(m,n,k\right)=\frac{R_{mnk}\left|\xi\right|^N}{2\left(1+\left|\xi\right|^2\right)^N}$$
$$\times\left[\left|\xi\right|^{N-2n}+\left|\xi\right|^{-N+2n}+2\left(-1\right)^m\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\left(N-2n\right)\right)\right], \tag{14}$$

here

$$R_{mnk}=\frac{N!}{\left(\frac{n+m-k}{2}\right)!\left(\frac{n-m+k}{2}\right)!\left(\frac{m-n+k}{2}\right)!\left(N-\frac{n+m+k}{2}\right)!}, \tag{15}$$

and the interference described by the last term in (14) is negligible compared with the principal maxima located at $(N,N,N\pm N/\sqrt{3})/2$.

In the continuous case it is known that the appropriate representation, that "sees" the interference pattern is provided by the Wigner function, defined as a self-dual image of the density matrix (when the same type of mapping is used both for the density operator and for the observables in order to compute average values by convoluting corresponding symbols). In addition, the continuous analog of the kernel (6) for $s=0$ possesses another important property: integration of the Wigner function along a strip in phase-space gives the marginal probability associated to the corresponding area.

In the standard construction [17], the straight lines,

$$\beta=\xi\alpha+\nu. \tag{16}$$

in DPS can be associated with (appropriately ordered [21]) eigenstates of sets of commuting monomials $\{X_{\xi\alpha}Z_\alpha\}$.

The discrete self-dual map (4), $s=0$, only guarantees that summing the Wigner function along axes $\alpha=0$ and $\beta=0$ leads to the correct projections on the logical basis $|\kappa\rangle$ and the dual basis $|\tilde{\kappa}\rangle$ respectively, where $|\tilde{\kappa}\rangle$ are eigenstates of X_β operators. The requirement that summing along any line (16) gives the marginal probability distribution for the observable associated with that line, is an additional condition. This so-called *tomographic condition* restricts the possible choices of the phase (8) of the displacement operator (7). It is worth noting here, that the kernels $\Delta^{(\pm1)}(\alpha,\beta)$ do not depend on this phase.

A convenient way for constructing the eigenstates $\{|\psi_\nu^\xi\rangle\}$ of a commuting set $\{X_{\xi\alpha}Z_\alpha\}$ associated to the line (16) is to use the rotation operator V_ξ,

$$V_\xi Z_\alpha V_\xi^\dagger\sim Z_\alpha X_{\xi\alpha},\ [V_\xi,X_\nu]=0,\ V_0=I, \tag{17}$$

so that

$$|\psi_\nu^\xi\rangle=V_\xi X_\nu|0\rangle, \tag{18}$$

where $|0\rangle$ is the eigenstate of Z_α with positive eignevalues for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{F}_{2^N}$. The rotation operator expanded in the dual basis $|\tilde{\kappa}\rangle$ has the form [21]

$$V_\xi=\sum_\kappa c_{\kappa,\xi}|\tilde{\kappa}\rangle\langle\tilde{\kappa}|,\quad c_{0,\xi}=1. \tag{19}$$

where the coefficients $c_{\kappa,\xi}$ satisfy the following non-linear recurrence equation

$$c_{\kappa+\alpha,\xi}c_{\kappa,\xi}^*=\chi(\xi\alpha\kappa)c_{\alpha,\xi}, \tag{20}$$

so that the unbiasedness condition $|\langle\psi_\nu^\xi|\psi_{\nu'}^{\xi'}\rangle|^2=2^{-N}$, $\xi\neq\xi'$ between the states associated to the lines (16)

with different slopes is satisfied automatically, and the rotation of Z_α gives $V_\xi Z_\alpha V_\xi^\dagger = c_{\alpha,\xi} Z_\alpha X_{\alpha\xi}$. Geometrically, the action of V_ξ can be interpreted as rotations of the rays $\beta = \xi\alpha$: $\beta = 0 \overset{V_\xi}{\Rightarrow} \beta = \xi\alpha$. It is worth noting that V_ξ do not form an abelian group and satisfy the relation $V_\xi^2 = X_{\xi 2^{N-1}}$.

One of the possible family of solutions of (20) is

$$c_{\alpha,\xi} = (-i)^{h\left(\alpha^p \xi^{p/2}\right)},\ p = 1, 2, 4, 8..., 2^{N-1}, \qquad (21)$$

which can be verified by direct substitution.

The solution with $p = 1$,

$$c_{\alpha,\xi} = (-i)^{h\left(\alpha\sqrt{\xi}\right)}, \qquad (22)$$

where $\sqrt{\xi}$ is the square root of ξ uniquely defined on $\mathbb{F}_{2^N}$, possesses an extra symmetry. In this case the rotation of the horizontal axis to the ray with the slope $\xi = 1$ ($\pi/4$ rotation) is factorized,

$$V_1 = \otimes_j \sum_{k_j=0,1} (-i)^{k_j} |\widetilde{k_j}\rangle\langle\widetilde{k_j}|,$$

and in addition the transformation

$$V_1 Z_\alpha V_1^\dagger = (-i)^{h(\alpha)} Z_\alpha X_\alpha,$$

produces no phase during the conversion of $Z_\alpha = \sigma_z^{\alpha_1} \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_z^{\alpha_N}$ into $(-i)^{h(\alpha)} Z_\alpha X_\alpha = \sigma_y^{\alpha_1} \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_y^{\alpha_N}$.

It is worth noting that another solution of Eq. (20) is closely connected to the so-called graph-state formalism [27] and has the form

$$c_{\alpha,\xi} = (\pm i)^{\alpha^\intercal \Gamma \alpha}, \qquad (23)$$

where $\alpha^\intercal = [\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_N]$ and $\Gamma_{pq} = [tr(\xi\theta_p\theta_q)]$ is the adjacency matrix of the graph (with loops) corresponding to the ray $\beta = \xi\alpha$.

C. Tomographic condition and permutation invariance

The imposition of the tomographic condition

$$\frac{1}{2^N}\sum_{\alpha,\beta} W_\rho^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)\,\delta_{\beta,\xi\alpha+\mu} = \langle\psi_\nu^\xi|\rho|\psi_\nu^\xi\rangle, \qquad (24)$$

leads to the following relation between the coefficients of the rotation operator (19) and the phase of the displacement operator (7).

$$\phi(\tau,\upsilon) = c_{\tau,\tau^{-1}\upsilon}. \qquad (25)$$

In this case the symbol of the state $|\psi_\nu^\xi\rangle$ is just a straight line (16),

$$W^{(0)}_{|\psi_\nu^\xi\rangle}(\alpha,\beta) = \delta_{\beta,\xi\alpha+\nu}, \qquad (26)$$

and the kernel $\Delta^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)$ acquires the form of the sum of projectors on the lines crossing at the phase-space point (α,β) [17],

$$\Delta^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta) = |\tilde{\alpha}\rangle\langle\tilde{\alpha}| + \sum_{\xi,\nu} \delta_{\beta,\xi\alpha+\nu} |\psi_\nu^\xi\rangle\langle\psi_\nu^\xi| - I\,. \qquad (27)$$

In particular, the solution (21) leads to the following phase

$$\phi(\alpha,\beta) = c_{\alpha,\alpha^{-1}\beta} = (-i)^{h\left(\alpha^{p/2}\beta^{p/2}\right)},\ p = 1, 2, ..., 2^{N-1}. \qquad (28)$$

In the simplest (and the most symmetric) case, $p = 1$, when

$$\phi(\alpha,\beta) = (-i)^{h\left(\sqrt{\alpha\beta}\right)},$$

the Wigner function $W_\rho^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)$ has the following form for

a) GHZ-state

$$W^{(0)}_{GHZ}(\alpha,\beta) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\beta,1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\beta,0} + \frac{1}{2^N}\chi(\alpha)\,\mathrm{Re}\left[(1-i)^N\, i^{h\left(\sqrt{\beta}\right)}\right], \qquad (29)$$

where the last term clearly represents the interference, practically absent, for instance, in $W^{(-1)}_{GHZ}(\alpha,\beta)$, Eq.(14);

b) W-state (the Dicke state with one excitation), which in terms of $\mathbb{F}_{2^N}$ elements can be conveniently represented as $|W\rangle = N^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^N |\theta_i\rangle$, here θ_i are elements of a self-dual basis,

$$W_W^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{p=1}^N \delta_{\beta,\theta_p} + \frac{(1-i)^N}{2^N N}\sum_{p\neq q}^N (-1)^{\alpha_p+\alpha_q}\, i^{h\left(\sqrt{\frac{\beta+\theta_p}{\theta_q+\theta_p}}\right)}, \qquad (30)$$

where α_p in the interference term are components of α in the self-dual basis $\{\theta_i\}$.

c) The Wigner function of SU(2) coherent states $|\zeta\rangle$ is in general fairly complicated, except for equatorial states, when $\zeta = 1$ and $|\zeta = 1\rangle = 2^{-N/2}\sum_\kappa |\kappa\rangle$, here $|\kappa\rangle$ is the logical basis,

$$W_{|\zeta=1\rangle}(\alpha,\beta) = \delta_{\alpha,0}.$$

1. *Symmetric Wigner mapping*

In order to construct a self-contained projection of $W_\rho^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)$ on the space of symmetric measurements similar to (12), the map $\Delta^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)$ should satisfy the basic condition that the symbol $W_S^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)$ of any symmetric operator $\hat{S}$ is a permutation-invariant function of the

phase-space coordinates. This condition requires invariance of $\Delta^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)$ under particle permutations,

$$\hat{\Pi}_{ij}\Delta^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)\hat{\Pi}_{ij}=\Delta^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta), \tag{31}$$

and is fulfilled only when the phase (8) is an invariant function under *the same* permutations of α and β.

Theorem: There does not exist a complete set of permutation-invariant phases $\phi(\alpha,\beta)$ satisfying the condition (25).

Proof: The relation (25) leads to the following recurrence equation for the phase $\phi(\alpha,\beta)$

$$\phi(\alpha+\beta,\alpha\xi+\beta\xi)=\chi(\alpha\beta\xi)\phi(\alpha,\alpha\xi)\,\phi(\beta,\beta\xi).$$

Let us suppose that $\phi(x,y)$ is invariant under a permutation of x and y, then $\chi(\alpha\beta\xi)=\chi((\alpha)(\beta)(\alpha\xi)(\beta\xi))$ (here we have used the property $tr(\alpha)=tr(\alpha^2)$) must be also invariant under *the same* permutation of $\alpha,\beta,\beta\xi$ and $\alpha\xi$. Nevertheless, a permutation of r-th and s-th qubits does not leave invariant $\chi(\alpha\beta\xi)$ when $\alpha=\theta_p^2$, $\beta=\theta_p+\theta_q$, $\xi=(\theta_r+\theta_s)^{-1}$ such that $tr\left(\theta_r\theta_p^2\right)=tr\left(\theta_s\theta_p^2\right)$ for any q satisfying $q\neq p\neq r\neq s$ (here θ_j are elements of a self-dual basis). In fact, taking into account that under permutation of r-th and s-th qubits the N-tuple α is transformed into $\alpha'=\alpha+\varepsilon tr(\alpha\varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon=\theta_r+\theta_s$ we observe that

$$\chi\left([\alpha'][\beta']\left[\alpha\varepsilon^{-1}\right]'\left[\beta\varepsilon^{-1}\right]'\right)=-\chi\left([\alpha][\beta]\left[\beta\varepsilon^{-1}\right]\left[\alpha\varepsilon^{-1}\right]\right)$$

which means that for these values α,β and ξ the phase $\chi([\alpha][\beta][\beta\xi][\alpha\xi])$ is not invariant under the permutation ε.

Thus, one can not project the Wigner map (27) into the space of symmetric measurements in a manner similar to (12).

2. Permutation-invariant phase

As we have proved, the tomographic condition is incompatible with the permutation invariance of the phase (8). Nevertheless, withdrawing this requirement and demanding only the Hermiticity of the map (9) one can find multiple permutation-invariant solutions of Eq.(10). The simplest one is an arbitrary distributed (on $\pm$ signs) set of square roots,

$$\phi(\alpha,\beta)=\pm\sqrt{\chi(\alpha\beta)}. \tag{32}$$

Also, the phase $\phi(\alpha,\beta)$ can be represented directly as a function of the lengths (11), $\phi(\alpha,\beta)=\phi(h(\alpha),h(\beta),h(\alpha+\beta))$. The simplest form of such phase is

$$\phi(\alpha,\beta)=(-1)^{f(\alpha,\beta)}i^{\frac{h(\alpha)+h(\beta)-h(\alpha+\beta)}{2}}, \tag{33}$$

(observe that $h(\alpha)+h(\beta)-h(\alpha+\beta)=2\sum_i\alpha_i,\beta_i$) where $f(\alpha,\beta)$ is an arbitrary permutation invariant function. If the function $f(\alpha,\beta)$ is in addition factorizable,

$$f(\alpha,\beta)=\sum_i f_i(\alpha_i,\beta_i),$$

the kernel $\Delta^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)$ has a product form,

$$\Delta^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)=\otimes_i\Delta_i^{(0)}(\alpha_i,\beta_i), \tag{34}$$

$$\Delta_i^{(0)}(\alpha_i,\beta_i)=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\gamma_i,\delta_i=0}^{1}(-1)^{\alpha_i\delta_i+\beta_i\gamma_i+f(\gamma_i,\delta_i)}i^{\gamma_i\delta_i}\sigma_z^{\gamma_i}\sigma_x^{\delta_i}.$$

Although, the property (26) is not true for the permutation invariant map (34) in general, it still holds for the factorized bases (eigenstates of the sets $\{Z_\alpha\}$, $\{X_\alpha\}$, $\{Z_\alpha X_\alpha\}$),

$$W_{|\kappa\rangle\langle\kappa|}(\alpha,\beta)=\delta_{\beta,\kappa},$$
$$W_{|\tilde{\kappa}\rangle\langle\tilde{\kappa}|}(\alpha,\beta)=\delta_{\alpha,\kappa},$$
$$W_{|\psi_\kappa^1\rangle\langle\psi_\kappa^1|}(\alpha,\beta)=\delta_{\alpha+\beta,\kappa},$$

where $|\psi_\kappa^1\rangle=V_1|\kappa\rangle$.

Correspondingly, the symbols of symmetric operators are permutation invariant function, in particular, for the image of the SU(2) group element

$$g=\exp(i\varphi S_z)\exp(i\theta S_x)\exp(i\psi S_z),$$

where $S_{x,y,z}=\sum_{i=0}^N\sigma_{x,y,z}^{(i)}$, being $\sigma_{x,y,z}^{(i)}$ Pauli matrices,

$$W_g(\alpha,\beta)=\cos^N\theta$$
$$\left[e^{i\phi+i\psi}+i\sqrt{2}\tan\theta\cos(\phi-\psi-\pi/4)\right]^{N-\frac{h(\alpha)+h(\beta)+h(\alpha+\beta)}{2}}$$
$$\left[e^{-i\phi-i\psi}+i\sqrt{2}\tan\theta\cos(\phi-\psi+\pi/4)\right]^{\frac{-h(\alpha)+h(\beta)+h(\alpha+\beta)}{2}}$$
$$\left[e^{i\phi+i\psi}-i\sqrt{2}\tan\theta\cos(\phi-\psi-\pi/4)\right]^{\frac{h(\alpha)-h(\beta)+h(\alpha+\beta)}{2}}$$
$$\left[e^{-i\phi-i\psi}-i\sqrt{2}\tan\theta\cos(\phi-\psi+\pi/4)\right]^{\frac{h(\alpha)+h(\beta)-h(\alpha+\beta)}{2}}$$

held for $f(\alpha,\beta)=0$.

The Wigner function defined with permutation-invariant phases can be faithfully mapped into the measurement space according to,

$$\tilde{W}_\rho^{(0)}(m,n,k)=\sum_{\alpha,\beta}W_\rho^{(0)}(\alpha,\beta)\,\delta_{m,h(\alpha)}\delta_{n,h(\beta)}\delta_{k,h(\alpha+\beta)}, \tag{35}$$

so that average values of any symmetric operator $\hat{S}$ is computed as a convolution

$$\langle\hat{S}\rangle=2^N\sum_{m,n=0}^{N}\sum_{k=|m-n|}^{\min(m+n,N,2N-m-n)}\tilde{W}_\rho^{(0)}(m,n,k)\tilde{W}_S^{(0)}(m,n,k),$$

where $\tilde{W}_S^{(0)}(m,n,k)$ is the Wigner symbol of $\hat{S}$.

For instance, the Wigner function under the choice (33) with $f(\alpha,\beta)=0$, for the GHZ state has the form

$$W^{(0)}_{|GHZ\rangle}(\alpha,\beta)=\frac{1}{2}\delta_{\beta,0}+\frac{1}{2}\delta_{\beta,1} +\chi(\alpha)\,\mathrm{Re}\left[(1+i)^N(-i)^{h(\beta)}\right]$$

which leads to the projection (35)

$$\tilde{W}^{(0)}_{|GHZ\rangle}(m,n,k)=\frac{1}{2}\delta_{n,0}\delta_{m,k}C_N^k+\frac{1}{2}\delta_{n,N}\delta_{m,N-k}C_N^m +R_{mnk}(-1)^{m+n}\,\mathrm{Re}\left[(1+i)^N i^n\right]$$

where R_{mnk} is defined in (15) and C_N^m are the Binomial coefficients. One can observe a large interference term centered at $(N/2,N/2,N/2)$ while the maxima corresponding to $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ are located now at $(N/2,0,N/2)$ and $(N/2,N,N/2)$ respectively (compare with (14)). This picture is very similar to the representation of the interference of Schrodinger cat-like states in the flat phase-space.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The discrete Wigner map corresponding to (4)-(6) at $s=0$ can be either permutation symmetric or satisfy the tomographic condition (24). In both cases there exist multiple constructions of such mappings. Symmetric maps allow the projection of the Wigner function into the space of symmetric measurements and detect the interference patterns, separated from the contribution of the incoherent terms. Nevertheless, there is no symmetric projection of the Wootters-like Wigner function defined by the map (27), which essentially limits the application of this map for analysis of large N-qubit systems.

During the preparation of this paper we found an article by Huangjun Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 040501 (2016) where the relation of the discrete Wigner function with permutation symmetry was analyzed in a different context.

This work is partially supported by the Grant 254127 of CONACyT (Mexico).

[1] M. Hillery, R.F. O'Connel, M.O. Scully and E. P. Wigner, *Phys. Rep.* **106,** 121 (1984)

[2] H. W. Lee, *Phys. Rep.* **259** 147 (1995); C. K. Zachos, D. B. Fairle and T. L. Curtright *Quantum mechanics in phase-space* (World Scientific) (2005).

[3] W. P. Schleich, *Quantum optics in phase-space* (Wiley-VCH) (2001).

[4] R. L. Stratonovich *Sov. Phys. JETP* **31,** 1012 (1956).

[5] J.C. Várilly and J.M. Gracia-Bondía *Ann. Phys.* **190,** 107 (1989).

[6] C. Brif and A. Mann *Phys. Rev. A* **59,** 971 (1999).

[7] R. J. Glauber *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10,** 84 (1963).

[8] E. C. G. Sudarshan *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10,** 177 (1963).

[9] K. E. Cahill and R. J. Glauber *Phys. Rev. A* **177,** 1857 (1969).

[10] G. S. Agarwal and E. Wolf *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21,** 180 (1968).

[11] P. A. Berezin *Comm. Math. Phys.* **40,** 153 (1975).

[12] L. J. Cohen *J. Math. Phys.* **7,** 781; *ibid.* 1976 **17,** 1863 (1966).

[13] N. Mukunda, G. Marmo, A. Zampini, S. Chaturvedi and R. Simon *J. Math. Phys.* **46,** 012106 (2005).

[14] G.S. Agarwal *Phys. Rev. A* **24,** 2889 (1981).

[15] A.B. Klimov and H. de Guise, J.Phys. A **43**, 402001 (2010).

[16] U. Leonhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4101 (1995); A. Luis and J. Peřina, J. Phys. A **31**, 1423 (1998); D. Galetti and A. F. R. De Toledo Piza, Physica A **149**, 267 (1988); A. Takami, T. Hashimoto, M. Horibe and A. Hayashi, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 032114 (2001); N. Mukunda, S. Chaturvedi, and R. Simon, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 114 (2004); T. Hakigolu, J. Phys. A **31**, 6975 (1998); D. Galetti and M. Ruzzi, Physica A **264**, 473 (1999); D. Galetti and M. Ruzzi, J. Phys. A **33**, 2799 (2000); D. Galetti and A. F. R. De Toledo Piza, Physica A **149**, 267 (1988); D. Galetti and A. F. R. De Toledo Piza, Physica A **186**, 513 (1993); D. Galetti and A. F. R. De Toledo Piza, Physica A **214**, 207 (1995); J. P. Bizarro, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 3255 (1994); R. Asplund, G. Björk and M. Bourennane, J. Opt. B: Quant. Semiclas. Opt. **3**, 163 (2001); R. Asplund and G. Björk, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 012106 (2001); A. M. F. Rivas and A. M. Ozorio de Almeida, Ann. Phys. (N Y) **276**, 123 (1999).

[17] W.K. Wootters, Ann. Phys. **176**, 1 (1987); K.S. Gibbons, M.J. Hoffman, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 062101 (2004); C. Cormick, E. F. Galvão, D. Gottesman, J. P. Paz and A. O. Pittenger, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012301 (2006); E. F.Galvão, Phys. Rev. **71**, 042302 (2005).

[18] G. Björk, J. L. Romero, A. B. Klimov and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **24**, 371 (2007); A. B. Klimov, J. L. Romero, G. Björk and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Ann.Phys. **324**, 53 (2009).

[19] I. D.Ivanović, J. Phys. A **14**, 3241 (1981); W. K.Wootters and B. D. Fields, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **191**, 363 (1989); A. Klappenecker and M. Rötteler, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. **2948**, 137 (2004); T. Durt, B.-G. Englert, I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, Int. J. Quant Inf. **8**, 535 (2010).

[20] A. Vourdas, Rep. Prog. Phys. **67** 267 (2004); J.P. Paz, A. J. Roncaglia, and M. Saraceno, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012309 (2005); C. Cormick, E.F. Galvao, D. Gottesman, J.P. Paz, and A.O. Pittenger, Phys. Rev. A 73, 012301 (2006); G. Bjork, A.B. Klimov and L.L. Sanchez-Soto, Prog. Opt. **51** 470 (2008).

[21] A.B. Klimov, C. Munoz and J. L. Romero, J. Phys. A, **29**, 14471 (2006).

[22] D. Galetti, and M.A. Marchiolli, Ann. Phys. **249**, 454 (1996); M. Ruzzi, M. A. Marchiolli, and D. Galetti, J. Phys. A **38**, 6239 (2005); A.B. Klimov, C. Munoz, and L.L. Sanchez-Soto, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 043836 (2009).

[23] C. Muñoz, A.B. Klimov, and L.L. Sanchez-Soto, J. Phys. A. **45**, 244014 (2012); A.B. Klimov and C. Muñoz, Phys. Scr. **87,** 038110 (2013).

[24] A.B. Klimov, and C. Muñoz, Phys. Rev. A **89,** 052130 (2014).

[25] J. Schwinger , Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **46**, 570 (1960); ibid. **46**, 883 (1960); ibid. **46**, 1401 (1960).

[26] D. Gottesman, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1862 (1996); E. Hostens, J. Dehaene, and B. De Moor, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 042315 (2005).

[27] M. Hein, W. Dur, J. Eisert, R. Raussendorf, M.V. den Nest and H.J. Briegel, Entanglement in graph states and its applications Quantum Computers, Algorithms and Chaos (International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi" vol CLXII) ed G. Casati , D. L. Shepelyansky, P. Zoller and G. Benenti, Societ'a Italiana di Fisica (IOS Press) pp. 115–218 (2006); A. B. Klimov, C. Munoz and L.L. Sanchez-Soto, J. Phys. A **45,** 215303 (2012).